

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 8 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melchione et al., (U.S. Pat. No. 5,966,695) in view of Burdick et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,625,816). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are the independent claims. Turning first to claim 1, it requires, *inter alia*, compiling marketing data from a plurality of disparate data sources into a centralized database and “creating a venue specific database as a subset of data contained within the centralized database wherein the venue specific database is in a format specific to the venue.” Applicants submit that neither Melchione et al. nor Burdick et al. disclose or suggest creating a venue specific database as a subset of data contained within the centralized database wherein the venue specific database is in a format specific to the venue. Acknowledging that Melchione et al. does not disclose creating a venue specific database, the Examiner cites Burdick et al. as disclosing the concept of a local database. Burdick et al. is directed to a method and system for generating product performance history, particularly for a semiconductor manufacturing. In Burdick, a composite database is stored in database servers serving one or more data sources such that each database server contains only a portion of the composite interface. [Burdick, Abstract] As stated in Burdick et al. In the section immediately following the section cited by the Examiner:

As discussed above, database 106 is decentralized into a number of database servers 105, 107. A product engineer or client within a particular facility, for example, the FAB facility, may have direct on-line access to that portion of database 106 contained with a database server, for example, local database server 105, located within that facility. [Burdick et al., col. 6, lines 51 – 57]

Applicant's submit that this teaching of a composite database that is distributed among a number of database servers, even where a database server is located within a particular facility, does not teach creating a venue specific database as a subset of data contained with the centralized database. In Burdick et al., the data on each database server is part of the composite database and is not a subset of data in the centralized database that is created to be a venue specific database. That is, applicant's invention requires both a centralized database and a venue specific database created as a subset of the data contained within the centralized database. Moreover, applicants submit that Burdick et al. fails to disclose or suggest that the data in any particular database server is in a format specific to the venue, as is required by claim 1.

Applicants also submit that since Burdick et al. teaches a de-centralized composite database that is shared among a number of servers, it teaches away from applicants' invention as claimed in claim 1 that requires a centralized database from which a venue specific database is then created. As such, applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to ignore Burdick et al's teaching of using a de-centralized composite database and replace it with a centralized database from which a venue specific database that is a subset of the data within the centralized database is then created.

Claim 6 is directed to a method for providing marketing data for a product/service in a venue specific form for consumers of the venue specific database. It requires, *inter alia*, extracting a subset of the marketing data from the centralized database and creating a venue specific database from the subset of marketing data wherein the venue specific database is used by the consumer to use the marketing data. For much the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicants submit that claim 6 is allowable.

Claim 7 requires, *inter alia*, an extract module for extracting a subset marketing data from a centralized marketing database wherein the extract module extracts marketing data specific to the requirements of a particular client of the data, and a venue specific database comprising the subset of marketing data. For the much the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicants submit that claim 7 is allowable.

Further, applicants submit that neither Melchione et al. nor Burdick et al. disclose or suggest an extract module that extracts a subset of marketing data from the centralized marketing database wherein the extract module extracts marketing data specific to the requirements of a particular client. The Examiner cites the section of Melchione et al. that discussed retrieving data from a central database as disclosing extracting data from a centralized database. However, this section of Melchione et al. discusses a user retrieving data via a graphic interface. [Melchione et al. col. 21, lines 9 – 12] This section does not disclose an extract module that extracts a subset of marketing data specific to the requirements of particular client. It just allows a user to "click and point to

information on a user friendly graphic interface. [Melchione et al. col. 21, lines 9 – 11] Applicants submit that claim 7 is allowable over Melchione et al. in view of Burdick et al. for these reasons also.

Claims 2 – 5 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claim 8 depends from claim 7 and is allowable for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec. 22, 2005

By: Roland A. Fuller
Roland A. Fuller, Reg. No. 31,160
(248) 944-6518
Attorney for Applicants

Ralph E. Smith
CIMS 483-02-19
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company LLC
DaimlerChrysler Technology Center
800 Chrysler Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326-2757
248-944-6519

Serial No. 09/923,646

Page 5 of 5